



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/033,478	12/27/2001	Chien Cheng Chen		8432

25859 7590 03/15/2005
WEI TE CHUNG
FOXCONN INTERNATIONAL, INC.
1650 MEMOREX DRIVE
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050

EXAMINER

MOONEY, MICHAEL P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2883

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/033,478

Applicant(s) **AK**

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Michael P. Mooney

Art Unit

2883

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 12-21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5 and 7-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Another reference has been found and the non-final rejection appears below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102e as being anticipated by Wood et al. (6396975).

Wood et al. teaches an optical switch for switching optical signals between a plurality of input and output optical fibers, including: a holder; a first stopper; a second stopper; a driver; at least one input collimator aligning with the input fibers and collimating the input light; at least one output collimator aligning with the output fibers and collimating the output light; and a switching element assembled with the holder and having an optical component displaceable between a first and a second positions and a rotating mechanism which rotationally moves the optical component between the first stopper and the second stopper; whereby, when the switching element is in the first

Art Unit: 2883

position, the optical component is in optical paths from the input collimators to the output collimators, and light beams from the input fibers transmit sequentially through the input collimators, the optical component, the output collimators, and then to the output fibers; and when the switching element is in the second position, the optical component is out of the optical paths, and light beams from the input fibers transmit through the input collimators, the output collimators, and to the output fibers, without being bent or deflected by the optical component to transmit to different output fibers.

(figs. 4b, 7a, Abstract).

Thus claim 1 is met.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2-3, 5, 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. (6396975).

Wood et al. teaches an optical switch for switching optical signals between a plurality of input and output optical fibers, including: a holder; a first stopper; a second stopper; a driver; at least one input collimator aligning with the input fibers and collimating the input light; at least one output collimator aligning with the output fibers and collimating the output light; and a switching element assembled with the holder and having an optical component displaceable between a first and a second positions and a rotating mechanism which rotationally moves the optical component between the first stopper and the second stopper; whereby, when the switching element is in the first position, the optical component is in optical paths from the input collimators to the output collimators, and light beams from the input fibers transmit sequentially through the input collimators, the optical component, the output collimators, and then to the output fibers; and when the switching element is in the second position, the optical component is out of the optical paths, and light beams from the input fibers transmit through the input collimators, the output collimators, and to the output fibers, without being bent or deflected by the optical component to transmit to different output fibers. (figs. 4b, 7a, Abstract).

By the above reasons and references and/or notoriously well known principles in the art, each an every element of claims 2-3, 5, 7-11 are also rejected.

It is noted that Wood et al. teaches a hinge mechanism at, e.g., col. 8 lines 5-15.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 12-21 are allowed.

Claims 4, 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

It is noted that the claims are allowable because the prior art does not teach or render obvious the unique combination of each and every specific element stated in each allowed claim.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael P. Mooney whose telephone number is 571-272-2422. The examiner can normally be reached during weekdays, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank G. Font can be reached on 571-272-2415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-

1562.


Michael P. Mooney
Examiner
Art Unit 2883


Frank G. Font
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2883

FGF/mpm
3/9/05